

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHRISTIAN GUADALUPE LARA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B263065

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TA134471)

APPEAL from the judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Tammy Chung Ryu, Judge. Affirmed.

Gusdorff Law and Janet Gusdorff, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

An information, filed on December 30, 2014, charged appellant Christian Lara with possession of a firearm prohibited under terms of probation, in violation of Penal Code section 29815, subdivision (a) (count 1), and possession of ammunition by a person prohibited from owning a firearm, in violation of Penal Code section 30305, subdivision (a) (count 2). At trial, Los Angeles County sheriff's department detectives testified that they searched Lara's residence pursuant to the terms of his probation. In a dresser drawer in the bedroom Lara shared with his wife, one detective found a gun inside of a case, and a box of ammunition. Lara waived his *Miranda* rights (*Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436) and told the deputies that he believed he had gotten rid of his guns, and later that he knew he had the gun and kept it for his protection. The jury found Lara not guilty of count 1, but guilty of count 2. The trial court sentenced Lara to 180 days in county jail, and three years of probation. The court also found Lara in violation of his existing probation, revoked his probation, and ordered him to serve 180 days in county jail, concurrent with his sentence in this case.

We appointed counsel to represent Lara in the matter. After examining the record, counsel filed a *Wende* brief raising no issues on appeal and requesting that we independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) On October 19, 2015, we sent a letter to Lara and to counsel. In the letter, we directed counsel to immediately send the record on this appeal and a copy of the *Wende* brief to Lara and informed Lara that he had 30 days to submit by letter or brief any ground of appeal, contention or argument he wished us to consider. We did not receive a response from him.

We have reviewed the entire record on appeal. Substantial evidence shows that Lara knowingly possessed ammunition in violation of the terms of his probation and thus supports Lara's conviction and the finding of a probation violation. (*People v. Johnson* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557, 578 [substantial evidence is that which is "reasonable, credible, and of solid value—such that a reasonable trier of fact could find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt"].) We are satisfied that Lara's counsel has fully complied

with her responsibilities and that no arguable appellate issue exists. (*People v. Wende*,
supra, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

We concur:

CHANEY, J.

JOHNSON, J.